	1		
1	Michael E. Cardoza, SBN – 52264 Dani R. Scott, SBN – 335284		
2	Cardoza Law Offices, Inc. 1407 Oakland Blvd. Ste. 200		
3	Walnut Creek, CA 94596 P: 925-274-2900 F: 925-274-2910		
4	MCardoza@cardolaw.com DScott@cardolaw.com		
5	Attorneys for Defendant		
6	HUGO VIGIL VILLAGOMEZ		
7	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	UNITED STAES OF AMERICA,		Case No.: 1:22-CR-00197-DC
10	Plaintiff,		STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE STATUS CONFERENCE AND EXCLUDE TIME
11	v.		
12	HUGO VIGIL VILLAGOMEZ ET AL, Defendants. UNDER SPEEDY TRIAL ACT Date: February 7, 2025		
13			
14	Defendants.		Time: 9:30 a.m. Honorable Dena Coggins
15			Tionorable Bena Coggins
16	This case is set for a status conference on February 7, 2025, which the parties stipulate		
17	to continue to March 28, 2025, for the reasons set forth below.		
18	1.	Defense counsel for HUGO VILLAC	GOMEZ has requested further discovery in this
19		matter including but not limited to ac	Iditional audio and video footage related to the
20	search warrants in this case, lab results related to DNA testing, and Cellebrite		
21	extraction reports for two cell phones.		
22	2. Furthermore, Defense counsel for HUGO VILLAGOMEZ has received a proposed		
23	settlement offer which he intends to consider after reviewing the outstanding		
24	discovery.		
25	3. Given the complexity of the case and depth of evidence, defense counsel for HUGO		
26	VILLAGOMEZ requires additional time to assess the aforementioned discovery as		
27	well as to confer with the client regarding the potential resolution. This is defense		
28	counsel's second request for a continuance.		

- 4. The proposed status conference date represents the earliest date that all counsel are available thereafter, taking into account counsels' schedules, defense counsels' commitments to other clients, and the need for preparation and further investigation into this case; however, although counsel for SERAFIN VIGIL is unavailable all of March, counsel for HUGO VILLAGOMEZ has authority to appear on counsel's behalf.
- 5. As to defendant SERAFIN VIGIL, exclusion of time is particularly appropriate because he is not detained pending trial.
- 6. As to defendant HUGO VILLAGOMEZ, time continues to be waived.

The parties further believe that time should be excluded, in that failure to grant the requested case schedule would unreasonably deny both the defendants and the government the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the parties' due diligence in prosecuting this case. 18 U.S.C. Section 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). Based on the above-stated findings, the ends of justice served by the schedule as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendant in trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act. Therefore, the parties request that the Court exclude the time from February 7, 2025, until the new status conference date on March 28, 2025, from calculations under the Speedy Trial Act.

Dated: February 6, 2025 /s/ DANI R. SCOTT DANI R. SCOTT Attorney for Defendant

Hugo Vigil Villagomez Dated: February 6, 2025

22

/s/ Kevin Rooney Attorney for Defendant Serafin Villagomez Vigil

Dated: February 6, 2025 /s/ Matthew De Moura

26

Assistant United States Attorney

27

28

[PROPOSED] O R D E R

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the status conference in this case be continued from February 7, 2025, until March 28, 2025, at 9:30 a.m.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the ends of justice served by the schedule set forth herein as requested outweigh the interest of the public and the defendants in a trial within the original date prescribed by the Speedy Trial Act for the reasons states in the parties' stipulation. For the purpose of computing time under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, et seq., within which trial must commence, the time period of February 7, 2025, and March 28, 2025, inclusive, is deemed excludable pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A), B(iv) because it results from a continuance granted by the Court at the parties' request on the basis of the Court's finding that the ends of justice served by taking such actions outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2/6/25

HONORABLE DENA COGGINS United States District Judge